## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

BRENDA LEE ESTERLY,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEERA CORPORATION, UNITED PACIFIC STORE 23560, and UNITED PACIFIC OIL,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:23-cv-5060

ORDER DISMISSING DEFENDANT SEERA CORPORATION

Plaintiff Brenda Lee Esterly filed this case against the Seera Corporation, United Pacific Store 23560, and United Pacific Oil on January 23, 2023. Dkt. No. 1. Summonses were issued as to Defendants Seera Corporation, United Pacific Store 23560, and United Pacific Oil on February 6, 2023. Dkt. No. 3. Esterly has not filed proof of service. Seera raised a "lack of service of process" as a defense in its answer to the complaint. Dkt. No. 9 at 3. On June 2, 2023, Seera moved to dismiss the complaint. Dkt. No. 11. Esterly did not respond to the motion. See generally Dkt.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) requires plaintiffs to serve defendants within 90 days after filing a complaint. Failure to serve a defendant within 90 days after the filing of the complaint is grounds for dismissal of the claims against the unserved

defendant. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Courts cannot exercise personal jurisdiction over a defendant unless a plaintiff has substantially complied with the service requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4.

Per Local Civil Rule 7(b), Esterly's failure to respond to Seera's motion may be deemed consent to entry of a dismissal order. *See* LCR 7(b)(2) ("[I]f a party fails to file papers in opposition to a motion, such failure may be considered by the court as an admission that the motion has merit."). The Court deems Esterly's failure to respond to this motion as an admission.

Having reviewed Seera's motion and the remainder of the record, the Court agrees that all claims against Defendant Seera Corporation should be dismissed without prejudice.

In sum, the Court ORDERS:

- Defendant Seera Corporation's motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 11) is
  GRANTED, and all claims against it are DISMISSED without prejudice.
- 2. Plaintiff has 14 days to show cause why her claims against United Pacific Store 23560 and United Pacific Oil should not also be dismissed without prejudice under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) for failure to effect timely service.

Jamal N. Whitehead

United States District Judge

Dated this 7th day of November, 2023.